

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 19-30 are pending. Claims 1, 4-7, 14, 16, and 19 have been amended, claims 3, 17, and 18 have been canceled, and new claims 20-30 have been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

I. The § 102 Rejection based on the Rosen Publication.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 9, 14, and 18 were rejected for being anticipated by the Rosen publication. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The Rosen publication discloses a mobile station that sets a retrieval period for slots of a paging channel based on a slot cycle index value. Setting this value determines how often the mobile station will transition between sleep and active states, and thus how much battery power will be used. (See Paragraphs [0100]-[0109]).

The Rosen publication also discloses that the state of operation of the mobile station changes depending on the capabilities of the mobile station. The Examiner appears to have relied on this portion of Rosen to supply the identifying step of original claim 1. However, Rosen does not teach or suggest the features added by amendment to claim 1.

As disclosed in Paragraph [0100], depending on the capabilities of the mobile station, the mobile station of Rosen will be set to monitor either a forward paging channel (F-PCH) or a

forward common control channel (F-CCCH). Rosen does not disclose changing a slot cycle index value for its mobile station based on the mobile station's capabilities.

More specifically, Rosen does not disclose "identifying a use of the MS based on subscriber information stored in a network circuit, said identifying being performed by the network circuit or another network circuit" and then "determining a slot cycle index value for the MS based on said use" as recited in claim 1. (See, for example, pages 8 and 9 of the specification for support).

Once the network circuit determines the slot cycle value based on the use indicated by the subscriber information, the index value is then transmitted to and set within the MS, and slots of a paging channel are retrieved accordingly. Rosen also does not disclose these features, i.e., Rosen discloses changing the slot cycle index value in a mobile station, but not based on a use of the mobile station as identified in the manner recited in claim 1.

Because the Rosen publication does not disclose all the features of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the Rosen publication does not anticipate this claim or any of its dependent claims.

Claim 9 recites "identifying one or more uses of the MS based on a subscriber information of the MS in an upper system," "deciding a retrieval period of a paging channel of the MS according to the uses," and "transmitting information indicative of the retrieval period to the MS." The Rosen patent does not disclose these features, i.e. Rosen only discloses changing

the channel it monitors (either a forward paging channel or a forward common control channel) based on the capabilities of a mobile station. Rosen does not disclose determining a retrieval period based on one or more uses of the MS, which uses are determined based on a subscriber information of the MS in an upper system. Rosen also does not disclose transmitting information indicative of such a period to a mobile station.

Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 and its dependent claims are allowable over the Rosen publication.

Claim 14 recites “searching subscriber information stored in at least one network circuit, and determining uses of the mobile stations based on the searched subscriber information, the subscriber information indicating a use of a first mobile station different from a use of a second mobile station.” The Rosen patent does not disclose any of these features.

Furthermore, claim 14 recites “determining a slot cycle index value for the first mobile station based on the use of the first mobile station determined in (b), determining a slot cycle index value for the second mobile station based on the use of the second mobile station determined in (b), transmitting the slot cycle index values to the first and second mobile stations; and setting slot cycle index values in the first and second mobile stations according to the uses.” Rosen also omits a disclosure of these features, when taken as a whole with the searching and determining steps previously recited in this claim.

Based on these differences, it is respectfully submitted that claim 14 and its dependent claims are allowable over the Rosen publication.

II. The § 102 Rejection based on the Henry patent.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected for being anticipated by the Henry patent. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

The Henry patent discloses that mobile station changes its slot cycle index value based on an operating mode it is in. If the mobile station is in an external power mode, the mobile station is set to one SCI value. The SCI value is then changed if the mobile station is set to another power mode. Changes in SCI value are also performed when the mobile station operates within time-of-day and environment modes. (See columns 9 and 10).

The Henry patent, however, does not indicate how it changes the SCI value. More specifically, Henry does not disclose setting a retrieval period of slots of a paging channel according to a use of the MS, “wherein said use is one indicated by subscriber information registered in a network circuit and wherein the retrieval period is set based on the following equation: $\text{Retrieval Period} = N * 2^{\text{SCI}} * T$, where N is a first constant value, SCI corresponds to the set slot cycle index value, and T is a second constant value equal to a predetermined slot period” (See for example, page 6 of the specification for support). Absent a disclosure of these features, it is respectfully submitted that the Henry patent does not anticipate claim 7.

III. The § 103(a) Rejections.

Claims 2-6, 10-13, 15-17, and 19 were rejected for being obvious in view of a Rosen-Henry combination. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1. In order to render claims 2-6 obvious, the Henry patent must therefore teach or suggest the features of claim 1 missing from the Rosen publication.

The Henry patent discloses that a mobile station that changes a slot cycle index value based on its operating mode. However, the Henry patent makes clear that the decision to change the SCI value takes place within the mobile station.

In contrast, claim 1 recites that the decision to change a slot cycle index value for a mobile station takes place outside of the mobile station, specifically by “identifying a use of the MS based on subscriber information stored in a network circuit, said identifying being performed by the network circuit or another network circuit.” The slot cycle index value is then determined based on the use and transmitted to the MS, where it is set for retrieving slots of a paging channel. The Henry patent does not teach or suggest these features, and therefore does not make up for the deficiencies of the Rosen publication with respect to claim 1.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 2 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Claim 5 recites that the “slot cycle index value is stored in a certain field of an order message transmitted through a paging channel to the MS.” In rejecting claim 5 as originally filed, the Examiner relied on paragraphs [0100] - [0109] of the Rosen publication to supply these features. However, no mention is made in these paragraphs of storing a slot cycle index value “in a certain field of an order message transmitted through a paging channel” to the MS. Applicants therefore submit that claim 5 is allowable, not only by virtue of its dependency from claim 1 but also based on the features separately recited therein.

Claims 11 and 14 recites features similar to those in claim 5 depending from claims 9 and 14 respectively. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 11 and 14 are also allowable.

IV. New Claims.

New claims 20-30 have been added to the application.

Claim 20 recites that the slot cycle index value is set in the MS of claim 1 is “based on a message received from a user of the MS, said message authorizing the MS to change a slot cycle index value previously stored in the MS to the transmitted slot cycle index value.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Rosen and Henry references.

Claims 21-23 respectively recite that the use in claim 1 is “servicing a call,” “a position-tracing use,” and “transmitting a character message.” (See, for example, page 6 of the specification for support). These features are not taught or suggested by the Rosen and Henry

references, i.e., Henry only discloses a power mode, a time-of-day mode, and an environmental mode.

Claim 24 recites that “the stored subscriber information includes billing information stored in a billing center.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Rosen and Henry references.

Claim 25 recites that “the stored subscriber information includes registration information stored in a home location register.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Rosen and Henry references.

Claim 26 recites that said retrieving includes “computing a retrieval period for a paging channel as follows: $\text{Retrieval Period} = N * 2^{\text{SCI}} * T$, where N is a first constant value, SCI corresponds to the set slot cycle index value, and T is a second constant value equal to a predetermined slot period.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Rosen and Henry references.

Claim 27 recites that “the network circuit or said another network circuit is selected from a message switching center, a base station, or a home location register.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Rosen and Henry references.

Claims 28-30 recite features similar to some of the dependent claims above, but depending from claim 14. It is therefore submitted that these claims are allowable for similar reasons.


Serial No. 10/714,621
Amdt. dated July 5, 2007
Reply to Office Action of February 5, 2007

Docket No. SI-0050

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Nitros, Esq.
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw

Date: July 5, 2007

\\Fk4\Documents\2029\2029-047\117794.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610